

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed September 20, 2004, the Examiner required an election under 35 U.S.C. § 121 among two allegedly distinct inventions, namely:

Invention I, referring to claims 1-4, drawn to digital signal processing to manage an outputting order of the decoding images; and

Invention II, referring to claims 5-7, drawn to encoding of a video signal according to its buffer fullness.

The Examiner has contended that Inventions I and II are unrelated in that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions or different effects. Moreover, the Examiner has contended that because Inventions I and II are distinct, the search required for Invention I is not required for Invention II. As such, the Examiner has required a restriction to either Invention I or Invention II for examination purposes.

In response to the restriction requirement, applicants hereby elect Invention I, claims 1-4, for further prosecution in this application. Accordingly, claims 5-7 stand withdrawn from further consideration in the present application, without prejudice to applicants' right to file a divisional application directed thereto.

No fee is believed necessary for this response. However, if the Examiner believes a fee is due, he is authorized to charge Deposit Account 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: October 11, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert B. Cohen

Registration No.: 32,768

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

LD-447\

520362_1.DOC